Teleconference Summary

ETV Wet Weather Flow Technologies (WWF) Pilot
Technology Panel on High Rate Separation
September 30, 1999

Participants:		
	Mary Stinson	USEPA
	Rich Field	USEPA
	John Schenk	NSF
	Kevin Smith	NSF
	Jim Zaccagnino	URS-Greiner
	Peter Young	Hazen & Sawyer
	George Zukovs	XCG Consultants

The panel undertook the review of Version 2.0 of the Vortex Separator Generic Protocol. Written comments were provided by Bob Andoh HIL, and after the meeting by Jim Zaccagnino URS-Greiner.

1. A panel member indicated that the term "emerging technologies" be replaced with "innovative and commercially available technologies".
2. A panel member suggested that the vortex separator description (Section 1.4) include the following statement: "some configurations include gross solids (floatables/aesthetic pollutants) capture mechanisms and route the captured material to a wastewater treatment facility for final treatment".
3. Panel members suggested that a number of definitions be included in the glossary of terms, including full operating cycle and core, supplemental and other parameters.
4. Panel members discussed at length the merits of including more detailed site descriptions in support of the Test Plan and Verification Document. It was agreed that the extended site description would be removed as a protocol requirement and included only as a suggestion.
5. Panel members indicated the need for specification of target influent flow ranges for verification testing. It was agreed that an approach would be developed indicating a requirement for test unit operation in excess of say 66% of capacity for some fraction of the test period.
6. Panel members discussed whether the vortex protocol was geared exclusively to full-scale installations or whether pilot/prototype units would be considered. If pilot/prototype units are to be tested, there would likely be a need for more initial influent characterization. The panel generally felt that most testing would be already in place full scale units but that the protocol should be sufficiently general to allow for other test situations.
7. A panel member suggested that long term (say 6 months) testing should be encouraged and that the protocol should require testing for some minimum period (or number of events).

It was agreed that the protocol would be modified to include some statement of minimum requirements for acceptable testing.

8. Panel members suggested some additional performance parameters. Core parameters to add settable solids, other parameters assessing treatability to add non-settable solids.
9. A panel member suggested that shutdown phase be defined as "the time following a storm when the influent flow rate drops below the underflow rate and the volume in the vortex unit starts to drop".
10. A suggestion was made by a panel member that individual aliquots taken during the course of a storm event (influent, effluent, underflow) be analyzed and data presented.
11. A panel member indicated the potential difficulty of obtaining underflow measurements. It was noted that other full-scale studies have been successful in collecting underflow samples.
12. It was suggested that volumetric loading rate be added to the required operating parameters.